No stable dissipative phantom scenario in the framework of a complete cosmological dynamics

Norman Cruz,[1,*] Samuel Lepe,[2,†] Yoelsy Leyva,[3,2,‡] Francisco Peña,[4,§] and Joel Saavedra[2,¶]

[1] *Departamento de Física, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Casilla 307, Santiago, Chile*
[2] *Instituto de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso Casilla 4950, Valparaíso, Chile*
[3] *Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica, Chile*
[4] *Departamento de Ciencias Físicas. Facultad de Ingeniería y Ciencias, Universidad de la Frontera Casilla 54-D, Temuco, Chile*

(Dated: October 27, 2014)

We investigate the phase space dynamics of a bulk viscosity model in the Eckart approach for a spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker universe. We have included two barotropic fluids and a dark energy component. One of the barotropic fluids is treated as an imperfect fluid having bulk viscosity, whereas the other components are assumed to behave as perfect fluids. Both barotropic fluids are identified as either radiation or dark matter. Considering that the bulk viscosity acts on either radiation or dark matter, we find that viscous phantom solutions with stable behavior are not allowed in the framework of complete cosmological dynamics. Only an almost zero value of the bulk viscosity allows a transition from a radiation-dominated to a matter-dominated epoch, which then evolves to an accelerated late time expansion, dominated by dark energy.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.35.+d, 95.36.+x, 98.80.Jk

arXiv:1406.7348v2 [gr-qc] 23 Oct 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Observational evidence indicates that the present acceleration of the Universe may be successfully explained by a cosmic fluid with negative pressure, a concept which has been baptized dark energy. This exotic component contributes about 68% [1] of the total energy of the Universe. Evidence for dark energy is provided by several complementary probes such as the high redshift surveys of supernovae [2], the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [1, 3, 4], and the integrated Sachs-Wolfe effect [5, 6].

Dark energy is considered a fluid characterized by a negative pressure and is usually represented by the equation of state $w \approx -1$.[1] This is confirmed by the latest Planck results [1], which give $w = -1.13^{+0.24}_{-0.25}$ and $w = -1.09 \pm 0.17$ (2σ C.L.) by using CMB data[2] combined with BAO [9–13] and Union2.1 [14] data, respectively, for a constant w model. However, when the same CMB data are combined with SNLS compilation[3] [15] and the Hubble constant H_0 [16], the equation of state (EOS) for this dark component are $w = -1.13^{+0.13}_{-0.14}$ and $w = -1.24^{+0.18}_{-0.19}$ (2σ C.L.), respectively.

The phantom behavior, derived from dynamical scalar fields, has been studied in [17, 18]. In [17], the free parameters of phantom scalar field models with power law and exponential potentials were constrained using data compiled from CMB [3], BAO [9, 19], and Union2.1 [14]. These results, when considered together with those obtained in a similar analysis for quintessence models [20], and using the goodness of fit and information criteria, allowed the authors to conclude that the cosmological constant is more preferable, from the statistical point of view, than phantom and quintessence models, although the phantom dark energy model is slightly better at fitting the observational data than the quintessence. However, in [18], the best-fit values of the parameters for dark energy models, in which the phantom scalar field initially mimics a cosmological constant term to finally and slowly evolve toward the big bip singularity, are determined jointly with all other cosmological parameters by the Markov chain Monte Carlo method [21] using observational data on cosmic microwave background anisotropies and polarization [22, 23], Ia type supernovae [24–26], BAO [9, 14], big bang nucleosynthesis [27, 28], and Hubble constant measurements from HST [29]. Similar computations have been carried out for ΛCDM and quintessence scalar field models of dark energy [18]. It has been shown that the current data slightly prefer the phantom model, but the differences in the maximum likelihoods are not statistically significant. As such, the possibility of phantom behavior for the dark energy fluid cannot be discarded.

Furthermore, an important result, and prior to the discovery of the present speed-up of the Universe, was the fact that a dissipative mechanism like bulk viscosity may give rise to an accelerated evolution of the Universe [30–37]. At the same time, bulk viscosity provides the

* norman.cruz@usach.cl
† slepe@ucv.cl
‡ yoelsy.leyva@uta.cl
§ francisco.pena@ufrontera.cl
¶ joel.saavedra@ucv.cl

[1] $w = p/\rho$, where p and ρ are the pressure and energy density of the fluid.

[2] These CMB data are referred to as the combination of the WMAP polarization low multipole likelihood [7] + Planck temperature power spectrum [8].

[3] A sample of 473 type Ia supernovae.

only dissipative mechanism consistent, in a homogeneous and isotropic background, with the cosmological principle. Thus, it has been proposed as one of the possible ways to induce an accelerated phase in the evolution of the Universe, namely, early time inflation [38–41] or the present accelerated period [42–51].

In a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) universe, the inclusion of bulk viscosity allows the possibility of violating the dominant energy condition [31, 52] and hence phantom solutions. In the Eckart approach [53], bulk viscosity introduces dissipation by only redefining the effective pressure of the cosmic fluid, namely,

$$P_{_{eff}} = p + \Pi = p - 3\zeta H, \tag{1}$$

where p is the kinetic pressure of the cosmic fluid, Π is the bulk viscous pressure, H is the Hubble parameter, and the bulk viscosity coefficient, ζ, satisfies[4]

$$\zeta \geq 0,; \tag{2}$$

this latter requirement guarantees nonviolation of the local second law of thermodynamics (LSLT) [55, 56].

Since the equation of energy balance states that

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p + \Pi) = 0, \tag{3}$$

the violation of dominant energy condition, i.e., $\rho + p + \Pi < 0$, implies an increasing energy density of the fluid that fills the Universe.

Phantom behavior due to the presence of a bulk viscosity has been investigated in many cosmological contexts: in [42], a big rip singularity solution was obtained; the full causal Israel-Stewart-Hiscock framework theory [57] assumed a late time universe filled with only one barotropic fluid. Furthermore, the late time evolution of a Chaplygin gas model with bulk viscosity, in a causal and truncated version of the Israel-Stewart formalism and in the Eckart approach, was studied in [58]. In both frameworks, the authors found new types of future singularities. However, a viable phantom solution was derived only in the truncated approach. In the context of the Eckart approach, the following investigations have been addressed: big rip singularities for various forms of $w = w(\rho)$ and the bulk viscosity $\zeta = \zeta(\rho)$ [59]; little rip cosmologies [60, 61]; phantom crossing in modified gravity [43, 62]; and unified dark fluid cosmologies [63–67]. In addition, the conditions for the physical viability of a cosmological model in which dark matter has bulk viscosity and also interacts with dark energy were discussed in [51]. In this case, the model took into account radiation, baryons, dark matter and dark energy and considered a general interaction term between the dark components. In relation to the viscosity, the authors assumed the ansatz $\zeta \propto \zeta_0 H$, where H is the Hubble parameter and ζ_0 a positive constant. Joint analysis of the phase space of the model and the observational test shows that (a) complete cosmological dynamics requires either null or negative bulk viscosity; (b) observations consistently point to a negative value of the bulk viscous coefficient; (c) the phantom nature of dark energy ($w_{de} < -1$) was consistently suggested by the cosmological observations. The first two results found in [51] rule out any viscous model with the ansatz $\zeta \propto \zeta_0 H$, despite the latter result being in line with recent observations [1].

More recently, a deep discussion concerning degeneracy in bulk viscosity models when $\zeta \equiv \zeta(H)$ was presented in [50]. [5] In addition, the cases where ζ_i of some fluid i (e.g. radiation or dark matter) depends on its own energy density $\zeta_i \equiv \zeta_i(\rho_i)$ were discussed. The existence of phantom solutions for this latter Ansatz was studied using multiple observational tests. However, as a consequence of the degeneracy criterion used, it was not possible to obtain, in the observational analysis performed by the authors, the best-fit values/signs of parameters of the proposed viscosity models,[6] namely eg. the coefficient of the bulk viscosity.

In the present work we are interested in studying the phase space of the models proposed in [50]. Our main goal is to explore if the presence of a phantom solution is compatible with the so-called complete cosmological dynamics [51, 68]. According to this framework, at early enough times, all physically viable models must allow the existence of radiation- and matter-dominated periods previous to the present accelerated expansion of the Universe. The phantom solution is obtained by adding bulk viscosity (as a new extra imperfect pressure) to either radiation or pressureless matter [50].

The organization of the paper is as follows: in Sec. II we present the field equations for a flat FRW universe filled with two barotropic fluids and dark energy obeying a barotropic EOS. We assume that one of the barotropic fluids presents bulk viscosity, and the effective pressure is treated within the framework of the Eckart theory [53]. The bulk viscous coefficient is taken to be proportional to the square root of the energy density of fluid taken with an imperfect pressure. In Sec. III, we analyze the evolution equations from the perspective of dynamical systems. We studied two models by matching the barotropic fluids with radiation and dark matter. A detailed scheme of the critical points and their conditions upon the parameters of the model is shown. Finally, Sec. IV is devoted to conclusions.

[4] For a fluid on a FRW geometry, the local entropy production is defined as $T\nabla_\mu s^\mu = 9H^2\zeta$ [54], where $\nabla_\mu s^\mu$ is the rate of entropy production in a unit volume and T is the temperature of the fluid. Since the second law of thermodynamics provides that $\nabla_\mu s^\mu \geq 0$, then for an expanding Universe ($H > 0$) $\zeta \geq 0$.

[5] The model discussed in [51] is an specific case of $\zeta \equiv \zeta(H)$.

[6] Constraints on the dark matter viscosity can be found in [48] for two models: a) a constant ζ, and b) $\zeta \propto \zeta_0/\sqrt{\rho_m}$.

II. THE MODEL

We study a cosmological model in a spatially flat FRW metric, in which the matter components are two barotropic fluids and dark energy (DE). One of the barotropic fluids and the DE are assumed as perfect fluids, whereas the remaining fluid is treated as an imperfect fluid having bulk viscosity.

The Friedmann constraint and the conservation equations for the matter fluids can be written as

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\left(\rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_{\rm de}\right)\,, \tag{4a}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_1 = -3\gamma_1 H\rho_1 + 9H^2\zeta\,, \tag{4b}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_2 = -3\gamma_2 H\rho_2\,, \tag{4c}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_{\rm de} = -3H\gamma_{\rm de}\rho_{\rm de}, \tag{4d}$$

where G is the Newton gravitational constant; H the Hubble parameter; (ρ_1, ρ_2, $\rho_{\rm de}$) are the energy densities of barotropic and DE fluid components, respectively; and $\gamma_{\rm de}$ is the barotropic index of the equation of state (EOS) of DE, which is defined from the relationship $p_{\rm de} = (\gamma_{\rm de} - 1)\rho_{\rm de}$, where $p_{\rm de}$ is the pressure of DE. The term $9H^2\zeta$ in Eq. (4b) corresponds to the bulk viscous pressure of the first barotropic fluid, with ζ the bulk viscous coefficient. The nature of the barotropic fluids and the evolution of the model are determined once the value of barotropic indices (γ_1, γ_2) are set; eg., $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to pressureless matter (dark matter) and $\gamma = 4/3$ represents radiation.

We take the bulk viscous coefficient ζ to be proportional to the energy density of the first barotropic fluid in the form

$$\zeta = \zeta_0\left(\frac{\rho_1}{\rho_{10}}\right)^{\alpha}, \tag{5}$$

where ζ_0 and α are dimensionless constants and ρ_{10} is the present day value of the energy density of the first barotropic fluid. The choices $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = -1/2$ have been studied in the literature [47–49]. Both values allow for the reduction of the problems of the integrated Sachs-Wolfe effect for viscous UDM[7] models [47]. However, from a dynamical system point of view, it is possible to study the dynamics of the field equations (4) and (6) for arbitrary values of α. It is possible to cover the whole α parameter space with two cases, namely, $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\alpha \neq 1/2$. The first choice leads to the simplest mathematical problem with a two-dimensional phase space (see Sec. III), while for $\alpha \neq 1/2$ we obtain a more complex three-dimensional dynamical system. For mathematical simplicity, henceforth we will only study the case $\alpha = 1/2$. [8] Finally, the Raychaudhuri equation of the model is

$$\dot{H} = -4\pi G\left(\gamma_1\rho_1 + \gamma_2\rho_2 + \gamma_{\rm de}\rho_{\rm de} - 3H\zeta\right)\,. \tag{6}$$

[7] Unified dark matter models; see [48] and references therein.
[8] We will address the case $\alpha \neq 1/2$ in a forthcoming paper.

III. THE DYNAMICAL SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

In order to study all possible cosmological scenarios of the model, we proceed to a dynamical system analysis of Eqs. (4) and (6). Let us first define the set of dimensionless variables

$$x = \Omega_{de} \equiv \frac{8\pi G}{3H^2}\rho_{\rm de}\,, \quad y = \Omega_1 \equiv \frac{8\pi G}{3H^2}\rho_1. \tag{7a}$$

Then, the equations of motion can be written in the following, equivalent, form:

$$\frac{dx}{dN} = x\left(3y\left(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\right) - 3(-1+x)\left(\gamma_2 - \gamma_{\rm de}\right)\right) - x\sqrt{y}\xi, \tag{8a}$$

$$\frac{dy}{dN} = 3y\left((-1+y)\left(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\right) - x\left(\gamma_2 - \gamma_{\rm de}\right)\right) - (-1+y)\sqrt{y}\xi, \tag{8b}$$

where the derivatives are with respect to the e-folding number $N \equiv \ln a$ and

$$\xi = \frac{24\pi G}{H_0\Omega_{10}^{\frac{1}{2}}}\zeta_0, \tag{9}$$

where the condition (2) implies [see Eq. (5)]

$$\xi \geq 0. \tag{10}$$

In term of the new variables, the Friedmann constraint (4a) can be written as:

$$\Omega_2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3H^2}\rho_2 = 1 - x - y\,, \tag{11}$$

and then we can choose (x, y) as the only independent dynamical variables.

Taking into account that $0 \leq \Omega_2 \leq 1$,[9] and imposing the conditions that both the barotropic fluids and DE components be positive, definite, and bounded at all times, we can define the phase space of Eqs. (8) as

$$\Psi = \{(x,y) : 0 \leq 1 - x - y \leq 1, 0 \leq x \leq 1\,, \quad 0 \leq y \leq 1\}\,. \tag{12}$$

Other cosmological parameters of interest are the total effective EOS, w_{eff}, and the deceleration parameter, $q = -(1 + \dot{H}/H^2)$, which can be written, respectively, as

$$w_{eff} = -1 - \frac{\sqrt{y}\xi}{3} + y\left(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\right) + \gamma_2 - x\left(\gamma_2 - \gamma_{\rm de}\right), \tag{13a}$$

$$q = \frac{1}{2}\left(-2 - \sqrt{y}\xi + 3y\left(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2\right) + 3\gamma_2 - 3x\left(\gamma_2 - \gamma_{\rm de}\right)\right)\,. \tag{13b}$$

[9] Recall that, once we set the values of γ_1 and γ_2 we will able to identify Ω_1 and Ω_2 with the dimensionless density parameters of radiation and dark matter , if we set $\gamma_1 = 4/3$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$, and vice versa, if we set $\gamma_1 = 1$ and $\gamma_2 = 4/3$.

A. The case with $\gamma_1 = 1$ (dark matter) and $\gamma_2 = 4/3$ (radiation)

This case corresponds to a scenario where dark matter (DM) is treated as an imperfect fluid having bulk viscosity with a null hydrodynamical pressure. At the same time, it is clear from the definition of the dimensionless variables that $x = \Omega_{de}$, $y = \Omega_1 = \Omega_m$ and $\Omega_2 = \Omega_r$. The full set of critical points of the autonomous system (8a)-(8b), the existence conditions, and the stability conditions for $\gamma_1 = 1$ and $\gamma_2 = 4/3$ are summarized in Table I. The eigenvalues of the linear perturbation matrix associated to each of the critical points and some important physical parameters are given in Table II.

1. Critical points and stability

Critical point P_1 corresponds to a pure radiation-domination era, $\Omega_r = 1$, and always exists independently of the value/sign of the viscosity parameter ξ. It also represents a decelerating expansion solution with $w_{eff} = 1/3$ and $q = 1$. The stability of this critical point is the following:

- Unstable if $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi \geq 0$.

P_2 is a critical point dominated by the pressureless matter component, $\Omega_m = 1$, and always exists. This critical point exhibits two different stability behaviors, namely,

- Stable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $\xi > 3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$,
- Saddle if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 \leq \xi < 3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$.

From Table II, we notice that if $\xi^2 \ll 1$, there is a point that corresponds to a standard matter-domination period ($w_{eff} = 0$). An interesting fact of P_2 is the value of EOS parameter $w_{eff} = -\xi/3$. In the stable region ($\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $\xi > 3 - 3\gamma_{de}$), this critical point represents an accelerating phantom solution with $w_{eff} < -1$ if

$$\xi > 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{3-\xi}{3} < \gamma_{\rm de} < 1.$$

Despite this result being in correspondence with those observations that tend to mildly favor a present day value of w_{eff} in the phantom region, it will be shown in the next subsection that it is not possible to associate this behavior with a realistic late time solution.

P_3 corresponds to a scaling solution between pressureless matter and dark energy and exists when

$$\gamma_{\rm de} < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \xi \leq 3(1 - \gamma_{de}).$$

It represents an accelerated solution ($q < 0$) if

$$\gamma_{de} < \frac{2}{3}, \tag{14}$$

and shows a stable behavior given that

- $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi < 3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$.

In the particular case where $\xi \ll 1$, a strictly dark energy domination is recovered ($x = \Omega_{de} = 1$).

Finally, critical point P_4 represents a pure dark-energy-dominated solution ($\Omega_{de} = 1$) and always exists. The stability of P_4 is the following,

- Stable if $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi = 0$,
- Saddle if $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi > 0$.

For a dark energy fluid with $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi > 0$, this critical point is always an accelerated solution with a saddle behavior (see Table II for further details).

2. Cosmology evolution from critical points

According to the complete cosmological dynamics paradigm (see [51, 68] for recent discussion about this topic), our model should describe (a) a radiation-dominated era at early times (RDE), (b) a matter-domination era (MDE) at intermediate stages of the evolution, and finally, (c) the present stage of accelerated expansion of the Universe. The required dominance stages can be translated into critical points, and the desired transitions between them into the heteroclinic orbits that connect two critical points [69, 70].

According to the complete cosmological dynamics basis, one of the critical points of the model should correspond to a RDE, and this point should be unstable in nature. The unstable behavior of this critical point ensures that it can be the source of any orbits in the phase space. The only candidate in our model is the critical point P_1. In fact, P_1 satisfies the condition for pure radiation dominance ($\Omega_r = 1$) and always exists. Its unstable nature, for all realistic dark energy fluids ($\gamma_{de} < 1$), is clear in the previous section.

As we mentioned before, the Universe requires the existence of a matter-dominated era in order to explain the formation of the cosmic structure. This MDE is recovered by a P_2 ($\Omega_m = 1$), which always exists. However, as Table II shows, we cannot recover a standard pressureless matter-dominated picture ($w_{eff} = 0$, $q = 1/2$) unless $\xi = 0$ [10]. For a non-null value of ξ, P_2 represents a decelerating solution if $0 < \xi < 1$ ($q > 0$) or an accelerating expansion solution if $\xi > 1$ ($q < 0$); see Table II for further details. In both regions where $\xi \neq 0$, the presence of bulk viscosity leads to an undesirable expansion rate of the Universe and makes it impossible to associate this critical point with a realistic MDE.

An interesting characteristic of P_2 is that, for certain regions in the parameter space (ξ, γ_{de}), it represents not only an accelerated solution but also a phantom one. As

[10] Recall that the second law of thermodynamics requires a non-negative value of ξ; see (10).

TABLE I. Location, existence conditions according to the physical phase space (12), and stability of the critical points of the autonomous system (8a)-(8b) for $\gamma_1 = 1$ and $\gamma_2 = 4/3$. The eigenvalues of the linear perturbation matrix associated to each of the following critical points are displayed in Table II.

P_i	x	y	Existence	Stability
P_1	0	0	Always	Unstable if $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi \geq 0$
P_2	0	1	Always	Stable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $\xi > 3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$ Saddle if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 \leq \xi < 3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$
P_3	$1 - \frac{\xi^2}{9(-1+\gamma_{de})^2}$	$\frac{\xi^2}{9(-1+\gamma_{de})^2}$	$\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 \leq \xi \leq 3(1-\gamma_{de})$	Stable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi < 3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$
P_4	1	0	Always	Stable if $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi = 0$ Saddle if $\gamma_{de} < 1$and $\xi > 0$

TABLE II. Eigenvalues and some basic physical parameters for the critical points listed in Table I, see also Eqs. (7) and (13).

P_i	λ_1	λ_2	Ω_r	w_{eff}	q
P_1	$4 - 3\gamma_{de}$	$\mathrm{sgn}(\xi)\infty$	1	$\frac{1}{3}$	1
P_2	$-1 - \xi$	$3 - 3\gamma_{de} - \xi$	0	$-\frac{\xi}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\xi}{2}$
P_3	$-4 + 3\gamma_{\rm de}$	$\frac{1}{6}\left(-9 - \frac{\xi^2}{-1+\gamma_{\rm de}} + 9\gamma_{\rm de}\right)$	0	$-1 + \gamma_{\rm de}$	$-1 + \frac{3\gamma_{\rm de}}{2}$
P_4	$-4 + 3\gamma_{de}$	$\mathrm{sgn}(\xi)\infty$	0	$-1 + \gamma_{de}$	$-1 + \frac{3\gamma_{de}}{2}$

Table II shows, the presence of this phantom solution ($w_{eff} = -\xi/3 < -1$) in P_2 depends solely on the value of the viscosity parameter ξ and not on the nature of the dark energy component. [11] However, as Table I and Table II show, its stability behavior depends on the value of the barotropic index. [12] This stable and viscous phantom behavior of P_2 could be important time behavior of the Universe and, at the same time, could be in line with those cosmological observations that moderately favor the present date EOS parameter value in the phantom region $w_{eff} < -1$. However, it is not possible to select initial conditions that connect the RDE (P_1) to the phantom attractor solution (P_2) through a true MDE. As we mentioned before, only P_2 (with $\xi = 0$) could play this role. Furthermore, the conditions for the existence and stability of the viscous phantom solution restrict the autonomous system (8a)-(8b) to three critical points, namely P_1, P_2 and P_4, and none of them corresponds to a true MDE. In addition, another strong argument against the existence of this viscous phantom solution represented by P_2 comes from structure formation. The existence of dark energy and $\xi > 3$ do not lead to the correct growth of galaxies, as was shown in [48, 49]. Thus, it is not possible to associate this viscous phantom behavior in P_2 with a realistic late time solution. Figure 1 shows some example orbits in the plane (x, y) to illustrate this situation.

Another feature of the model is the presence of two more accelerated solutions, described by critical points P_3 and P_4. P_3 is a scaling solution between dark matter and dark energy and can be an attractor for $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi < 3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$ whereas P_4 is always a saddle solution for all realistic dark energy with $\xi > 0$. As Fig. 2 shows, the existence of an attractor phantom solution in P_3 depends on the dark energy component; in other words, it is only possible to obtain attractor phantom solutions if the phantom dark energy component, $w_{de} < -1$



FIG. 1. Vector field in the plane (x, y) for the autonomous system (8a)-(8b). The free parameters have been chosen to be (ξ, γ_{de})=(3.01, 0.01). In this case, the dark-matter-dominated solution, P_2, is the late time attractor of the system, representing a viscous phantom solution ($w_{eff} = -1.003$). This latter solution restricts the critical points of the system to three and none of them corresponds to a true MDE.

[11] For P_2 the value of the effective EOS parameter, $w_{eff} = -\xi/3$, is insensitive of the barotropic index of dark energy (γ_{de}).

[12] Recall that the viscous phantom solution of P_2 exists and is stable if: $\xi > 3$ and $(3 - \xi)/3 < \gamma_{\rm de} < 1$.



FIG. 2. The accelerated and stable region for critical point P_3 in terms of the parameters (ξ, γ_{de}) is represented by region I. Region II represents the zone for which the phantom solution exists and is stable. The lower region, labeled III, is forbidden by the LSLT ($\xi < 0$).



FIG. 3. Vector field in the plane (x, y) for the autonomous system (8a)-(8b). The free parameters have been chosen to be (ξ, γ_{de})=(0.01, 0.01). In this case, the DM-DE scaling solution, P_3, is the late time attractor of the system, representing an accelerated solution. The transition from the RDE (P_1) to P_3 allow us to select appropriate initial conditions to recover a true MDE (P_2) with $w_{eff} \simeq 0$ and $q \simeq 1/2$.

($\gamma_{de} < 0$), is present. A favorable scheme would be one in which the initial conditions allow for complete cosmological dynamics, eg., $P_1 \Longrightarrow P_2 \Longrightarrow P_4$. In terms of the cosmological evolution of the Universe, the above favorable scenario implies that the Universe started at early times from a RDE, then evolved into a MDE, to enter in the final phase of accelerated expansion. Recall that in this favorable scenario, it is necessary to select a sufficiently small value for the bulk viscosity $\xi \ll 1$ in order to recover a true MDE (P_2) and that is not possible to obtain a realistic phantom solution. It is important to emphasize that this finding on the allowed values of ξ corroborates the previous results of [48, 49] for the cases of $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = -1/2$. Figure 3 shows some example orbits in the plane (x, y) to illustrate the above situation.

B. The case with $\gamma_1 = 4/3$ (radiation) and $\gamma_2 = 1$ (DM)

This case corresponds to a scenario where radiation is treated as an imperfect fluid having bulk viscosity. At the same time, it is clear from the definition of the dimensionless variables that $x = \Omega_{de}$, $y = \Omega_1 = \Omega_r$ and $\Omega_2 = \Omega_m$. The full set of critical points of the autonomous system (8a)-(8b), and the existence conditions and the stability conditions for $\gamma_1 = 4/3$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$ are summarized in Table III. The eigenvalues of the linear perturbation matrix associated to each of the critical points and some important physical parameters are given in Table IV.

1. *Critical points and stability*

Critical point P_1 corresponds to a radiation-dominated era ($\Omega_r = 1$). The stability of this critical point is the following:

- Unstable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 \leq \xi < 1$,
- Saddle if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $1 < \xi < 4 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$,
- Stable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $\xi > 4 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$.

As expected, a background level at this point represents a true decelerating RDE if $\xi \ll 1$ ($w_{eff} \approx \frac{1}{3}$ and $q \approx 1$). If this condition is satisfied, P_1 behaves as an unstable solution. However, P_1 also mimics, at background level, dark matter ($w_{eff} = 0$) and phantom fluids ($w_{eff} < -1$) if the bulk viscosity is $\xi = 1$ and $\xi > 4$, respectively. If the phantom solution exists, then P_1 will behave as a stable late time solution of the autonomous system (8a)-(8b). We will discuss in more details the cosmological implications of this critical point in the next subsection.

Hyperbolic critical point P_2 corresponds to a scaling solution between radiation and dark matter and exists if $0 < \xi < 1$, being a decelerated solution $q = 1/2$. From a stability point of view, this critical point always has a saddle behavior demanding that

- $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi < 1$.

At the limit, when $\xi \ll 1$, this point recovers a true DME ($\Omega_m = 1$).

TABLE III. Location, existence conditions according to the physical phase space (12), and stability of the critical points of the autonomous system (8a)-(8b) for $\gamma_1 = 4/3$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$. The eigenvalues of the linear perturbation matrix associated to each of the following critical points are displayed in Table IV.

P_i	x	y	Existence	Stability
P_1	0	1	Always	Stable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $\xi > 4 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$ Unstable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 \leq \xi < 1$ Saddle if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $1 < \xi < 4 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$
P_2	0	ξ^2	$0 < \xi < 1$	Saddle if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi < 1$
P_3	0	0	Always	Unstable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $\xi > 0$ Saddle if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $\xi = 0$
P_4	$1 - \frac{\xi^2}{(4-3\gamma_{\rm de})^2}$	$\frac{\xi^2}{(4-3\gamma_{\rm de})^2}$	$\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi \leq 4 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$	Stable if $\gamma_{\rm de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi < 4 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$
P_5	1	0	Always	Stable if $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi = 0$ Saddle if $\gamma_{de} <$ 1and $\xi > 0$

TABLE IV. Eigenvalues and some basic physical parameters for the critical points listed in Table III; see also Eqs. (7) and (13). We have used the definition $A = \text{Abs}\left[8 + \xi^2 + 9\left(-2 + \gamma_{\rm de}\right)\gamma_{\rm de}\right]$.

P_i	λ_1	λ_2	Ω_m	w_{eff}	q
P_1	$1 - \xi$	$4 - \xi - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$	0	$\frac{1}{3} - \frac{\xi}{3}$	$1 - \frac{\xi}{2}$
P_2	$\frac{1}{2}\left(-1 + \xi^2\right)$	$3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$	$1 - \xi^2$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$
P_3	$\text{sgn}(\xi)\infty$	$3 - 3\gamma_{\rm de}$	1	0	$\frac{1}{2}$
P_4	$\frac{1}{4}\left(-10 + 9\gamma_{\rm de} + \frac{-\xi^2+A}{-4+3\gamma_{\rm de}}\right)$	$\frac{1}{4}\left(-10 + \frac{\xi^2+A}{4-3\gamma_{\rm de}} + 9\gamma_{\rm de}\right)$	0	$-1 + \gamma_{\rm de}$	$-1 + \frac{3\gamma_{\rm de}}{2}$
P_5	$-4 + 3\gamma_{de}$	$\text{sgn}(\xi)\infty$	0	$-1 + \gamma_{de}$	$-1 + \frac{3\gamma_{de}}{2}$

Critical point P_3 corresponds to a pure DM dominance solution ($\Omega_m = 1$, $w_{eff} = 0$) and always exists. A striking aspect of this solution is its dynamical behavior: for a non-null bulk viscosity on the radiation fluid, P_2 behaves as an unstable solution (see Table III). This means that it is not possible to associate P_3 with an intermediate stage of matter domination in the evolution of the Universe.

The hyperbolic critical point P_4 represents a scaling solution between radiation and DE. In addition, it is a stable solution for

- $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $0 < \xi < 4 - 3\gamma_{de}$.

As Table IV shows, P_4 is an accelerated solution if

$$-1 + \frac{3}{2}\gamma_{de} < 0, \tag{15}$$

recovering strictly dark energy domination if $\xi \ll 1$.

Finally, P_5 corresponds to a pure dark energy domination solution ($\Omega_{de} = 1$) and always exists. For a non null bulk viscosity, this critical point represents a saddle solution if

- $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $\xi > 0$.

Just like the previous critical point, P_5 represents an accelerated solution if (15) is satisfied.



FIG. 4. Vector field in plane (x, y) for the autonomous system (8a)-(8b) with $\gamma_1 = 4/3$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$. The free parameters have been chosen as (ξ, γ_{de})=(4.1, 0.01). In this case, the radiation-dominated solution, P_1 is the late time attractor of the system, representing a viscous phantom solution ($w_{eff} = -1.033$). This latter time attractor solution restricts the system to three critical points (P_1, P_3 and P_5) and none of them corresponds to a true early time RDE or MDE.

2. Cosmology evolution from critical points

To be in line with the complete cosmological dynamics, it is necessary to associate an unstable critical point with a RDE. In this model, we can identify two critical points with an unstable behavior, namely P_1 and P_3. The first one represents a true RDE with $\Omega_r = 1$ and $w_{eff} = 0$ for $\xi \ll 1$, while the latter represents a dark matter solution $\Omega_m = 1$ and $w_{eff} = 0$. The fact that both solutions (P_1 and P_3) are unstable simultaneously, when $\gamma_{de} < 1$ and $0 \leq \xi < 1$, implies that we need to choose those initial condition in the neighborhood of P_1 to guarantee that the RDE is the source of any orbits of cosmological importance in the phase space. Otherwise, it will be impossible to obtain, in terms of P_3, a successful description of the early time evolution of the Universe. This analysis also implies that those scenarios, under a proper selection of the bulk viscosity parameter, in which P_1 mimics a MDE ($\xi = 1$) or a stable phantom solution ($\xi > 4$), are ruled out due to the impossibility of correctly reproducing, in a correct way, the dynamics of the early time Universe. Figure 4 shows some example orbits in the phase space to illustrate the situation in which P_1 mimics a stable phantom solution (late time attractor).

In addition to a RDE, we also need to associate a saddle critical point with a MDE. The saddle nature of this point guarantees that the cosmological solutions will remain for a lapse of time around it, before ultimately approaching a stable late time solution. The candidates in this model are P_2 and P_3. [13] As we mentioned before, P_3 always exhibits an unstable nature for a non-null value of the bulk viscosity ($\xi > 0$). As a possible past attractor of the model, all the orbits that start at P_3 describe solutions where there is not a radiation-dominated era preceding this point; thus, P_3 is ruled out as a true MDE. [14] Only P_2 is able to reproduce a true MDE. This critical point represents a scaling solution between radiation and DM fluids and its existence is a direct consequence of having considered bulk viscosity on the radiation fluid. In order to recover a true MDE ($\Omega_m = 1$), the following condition must be met: $\xi \ll 1$. In addition, Tables III and IV show that, despite it being a scaling solution between radiation and DM, P_2 is not able to mimic, at background level, a true RDE, even if $\xi \approx 1$ ($\Omega_r \approx 1$), since $w_{eff} = 0$.

Finally, the model has two more accelerated critical points: P_4 and P_5.[15] In the first case, P_4 represents a stable scaling solution between radiation and dark energy fluids. As shown in Table IV, the presence of a bulk viscosity on the radiation fluid does not induce a crossing of the phantom divide in P_4, and thus this crossing is only possible if a phantom dark energy fluid is considered in the model ($\gamma_{de} < 0$). On the other hand, P_5 corresponds to a pure dark-energy-domination period, and has saddle behavior for a non-null value of the bulk viscosity. In this model, a favorable scenario would be a transition from $P_1 \Longrightarrow P_2 \Longrightarrow P_4$: starting in a RDE at early times, then entering into a MDE to finally evolve to a stable accelerated phase. This positive transition is represented in Figure 5 through several orbits in the phase space of the model. As we commented before, the existence of a RDE and MDE, in terms of P_1 and P_4, respectively, demands that $\xi \ll 1$. This latter requirement also implies that the phantom solution with a stable behavior (P_1 with $\xi > 4$) is not compatible with a well-behaved model from the point of view of the complete cosmological dynamics.



FIG. 5. Vector field in the plane (x, y) for the autonomous system (8a)-(8b) with $\gamma_1 = 4/3$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$. The free parameters have been chosen as (ξ, γ_{de})=(0.01, 0.01). In this case, the radiation-DE scaling solution, P_4, is the late time attractor of the system, representing an accelerated solution. The transition from the RDE (P_1) to P_4 allows for the selection of appropriate initial conditions to recover a true MDE (P_2) with $w_{eff} \simeq 0$ and $q \simeq 1/2$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Late time evolutions of a dissipative fluid leading to a universe with phantom behavior have been investigated within different approaches, e.g., [42, 50, 51]. In this work, our aim was to study the dynamics of a universe filled with radiation, dark matter, and dark energy, where bulk viscosity may be present in one of the matter fluids, with emphasis on the viability of phantom solutions. In the first studied model, the dissipation in

[13] Recall that P_1 is ruled out as a MDE even if $\xi = 1$ ($w_{eff} = 0$).
[14] The presence of a RDE is necessary to describe process such as the primordial nucleosynthesis.
[15] Recall that P_1 is able to mimics an stable phantom solution if $\xi > 4$ but this possibility is discarded because the model is not able to describe a RDE and MDE, as shown in Fig. 4.

the dark matter was characterized by the bulk viscosity proportional to the dark matter energy density, i.e., $\zeta = \zeta_0\sqrt{\rho_m/\rho_{m0}}$ [50]; whereas in the second model, the dissipation in the radiation was described by the bulk viscosity proportional to the radiation energy density, i.e., $\zeta = \zeta_0\sqrt{\rho_r/\rho_{r0}}$ [50]. In both models, the study was restricted to the cases in which $\zeta \geq 0$, a condition that comes from the local second law of thermodynamics [54–56].

Recall that in [51], only the case of bulk viscosity in dark matter was studied. Furthermore, the ansatz on the bulk viscosity now used [50] is different from that used in [51]. Hence, the results obtained in our work are new compared with those obtained in [51].

By making a dynamical system analysis of both possible scenarios and imposing the requirement that both models must follow the so called complete cosmological dynamics, we found that viscous phantom solutions with a stable behavior are not allowed. This results from the fact that it is not possible to recover a viable MDE in the first model if the viscous phantom solution exists (P_2 with $\xi > 3$) and, in the second model, the existence of a stable viscous phantom solution (P_1 with $\xi > 4$) does not allow for the existence of a true RDE and MDE. In other words, there is no smooth transition from a radiation-dominated epoch to a matter-dominated phase to an accelerated late time expansion dominated by dark energy. For the purposes of illustration, we have shown some numerical elaboration for several values of the free parameters of the models (ξ, γ_{de}).

Additionally, it was shown that, in both models, it is possible to accommodate complete cosmological dynamics whenever $\xi \approx 0$. It is noteworthy that these findings corroborate the results obtained in [48, 49]. However, in this favorable scenario, the late time attractor solution is characterized by $w_{eff} = -1 + \gamma_{de}$; therefore, the nature of this solution depends only on the nature of the dark energy fluid, namely, if the dark energy fluid is a quintessence (phantom) fluid $0 < \gamma_{de} < 2/3$ ($\gamma_{de} < 0$), then the late time stable solution corresponds to a quintessence (phantom) solution. If $\gamma_{de} = 0$, then the de Sitter solution will be the late time attractor.

As we mentioned before, we have focused only on the cases in which $\alpha = 1/2$ [see Eq. (5)]. Thus, the question of the viability of the phantom solutions in the Eckart approach, in terms of the complete cosmological dynamical, for $\alpha \neq 1/2$ is still an open problem. We hope to address this more general and complex scenario in a forthcoming paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors benefited from the many contributions to cosmology in Chile by our recently deceased colleague Sergio del Campo. We acknowledge the support of this research by CONICYT through Grant No. 1140238 (N. C.), Fondecyt Grant No. 1110076 (J. S. and S. L.) and PUCV-VRIEA Grant No. 037.377/2014 (S. L.). Y. L. thanks PUCV for supporting him through Proyecto DI Postdoctorado 2014. F. P. acknowledges Grant No. DI14-0007 of Dirección de Investigación y Desarrollo, Universidad de La Frontera

[1] P. Ade *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), (2013), arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
[2] A. G. Riess, L. Macri, S. Casertano, H. Lampeitl, H. C. Ferguson, *et al.*, Astrophys.J. **730**, 119 (2011), arXiv:1103.2976 [astro-ph.CO].
[3] E. Komatsu *et al.* (WMAP Collaboration), Astrophys.J.Suppl. **192**, 18 (2011), arXiv:1001.4538 [astro-ph.CO].
[4] G. Hinshaw *et al.* (WMAP), Astrophys.J.Suppl. **208**, 19 (2013), arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO].
[5] T. Giannantonio, R. Scranton, R. G. Crittenden, R. C. Nichol, S. P. Boughn, *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **D77**, 123520 (2008), arXiv:0801.4380 [astro-ph].
[6] T. Giannantonio, R. Crittenden, R. Nichol, and A. J. Ross, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **426**, 2581 (2012), arXiv:1209.2125 [astro-ph.CO].
[7] C. Bennett *et al.* (WMAP), Astrophys.J.Suppl. **208**, 20 (2013), arXiv:1212.5225 [astro-ph.CO].
[8] P. Ade *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), (2013), arXiv:1303.5075 [astro-ph.CO].
[9] W. J. Percival *et al.* (SDSS Collaboration), Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **401**, 2148 (2010), arXiv:0907.1660 [astro-ph.CO].
[10] N. Padmanabhan, X. Xu, D. J. Eisenstein, R. Scalzo, A. J. Cuesta, *et al.*, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **427**, 2132 (2012), arXiv:1202.0090 [astro-ph.CO].
[11] C. Blake, E. Kazin, F. Beutler, T. Davis, D. Parkinson, *et al.*, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **418**, 1707 (2011), arXiv:1108.2635 [astro-ph.CO].
[12] L. Anderson, E. Aubourg, S. Bailey, D. Bizyaev, M. Blanton, *et al.*, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **427**, 3435 (2012), arXiv:1203.6594 [astro-ph.CO].
[13] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith, *et al.*, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **416**, 3017 (2011), arXiv:1106.3366 [astro-ph.CO].
[14] N. Suzuki, D. Rubin, C. Lidman, G. Aldering, R. Amanullah, *et al.*, Astrophys.J. **746**, 85 (2012), arXiv:1105.3470 [astro-ph.CO].
[15] A. Conley *et al.* (SNLS Collaboration), Astrophys.J.Suppl. **192**, 1 (2011), arXiv:1104.1443 [astro-ph.CO].
[16] A. G. Riess, L. Macri, S. Casertano, H. Lampeitl, H. C. Ferguson, *et al.*, Astrophys.J. **730**, 119 (2011),

arXiv:1103.2976 [astro-ph.CO].
[17] P.-Y. Wang, C.-W. Chen, and P. Chen, (2012), arXiv:1208.6579 [astro-ph.CO].
[18] B. Novosyadlyj, O. Sergijenko, R. Durrer, and V. Pelykh, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 083008 (2012), arXiv:1206.5194 [astro-ph.CO].
[19] S. Cole *et al.* (2dFGRS Collaboration), Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **362**, 505 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0501174 [astro-ph].
[20] P.-Y. Wang, C.-W. Chen, and P. Chen, JCAP **1202**, 016 (2012), arXiv:1108.1424 [astro-ph.CO].
[21] A. Lewis and S. Bridle, Phys.Rev. **D66**, 103511 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0205436 [astro-ph].
[22] N. Jarosik, C. Bennett, J. Dunkley, B. Gold, M. Greason, *et al.*, Astrophys.J.Suppl. **192**, 14 (2011), arXiv:1001.4744 [astro-ph.CO].
[23] D. Larson, J. Dunkley, G. Hinshaw, E. Komatsu, M. Nolta, *et al.*, Astrophys.J.Suppl. **192**, 16 (2011), arXiv:1001.4635 [astro-ph.CO].
[24] J. Guy *et al.* (SNLS Collaboration), Astron.Astrophys. **466**, 11 (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0701828 [ASTRO-PH].
[25] R. Kessler, A. Becker, D. Cinabro, J. Vanderplas, J. A. Frieman, *et al.*, Astrophys.J.Suppl. **185**, 32 (2009), arXiv:0908.4274 [astro-ph.CO].
[26] M. Sullivan *et al.* (SNLS Collaboration), Astrophys.J. **737**, 102 (2011), arXiv:1104.1444 [astro-ph.CO].
[27] G. Steigman, Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci. **57**, 463 (2007), arXiv:0712.1100 [astro-ph].
[28] E. L. Wright, Astrophys.J. **664**, 633 (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0701584 [astro-ph].
[29] A. G. Riess, L. Macri, S. Casertano, M. Sosey, H. Lampeitl, *et al.*, Astrophys.J. **699**, 539 (2009), arXiv:0905.0695 [astro-ph.CO].
[30] M. Heller and Z. Klimek, Astrophysics and Space Science **33**, L37 (1975).
[31] J. D. Barrow, Phys.Lett. **B180**, 335 (1986).
[32] L. Diosi, B. Keszthelyi, B. Lukacs, and G. Paal, Acta Phys.Polon. **B15**, 909 (1984).
[33] I. Waga, R. C. Falcao, and R. Chanda, Phys.Rev. **D33**, 1839 (1986).
[34] T. Padmanabhan and S. Chitre, Phys.Lett. **A120**, 433 (1987).
[35] O. Gron, Astrophys.Space Sci. **173**, 191 (1990).
[36] R. Maartens, Class.Quant.Grav. **12**, 1455 (1995).
[37] W. Zimdahl, Phys.Rev. **D53**, 5483 (1996), arXiv:astro-ph/9601189 [astro-ph].
[38] S. del Campo, R. Herrera, D. Pavon, and J. R. Villanueva, JCAP **1008**, 002 (2010), arXiv:1007.0103 [astro-ph.CO].
[39] M. Bastero-Gil, A. Berera, R. Cerezo, R. O. Ramos, and G. S. Vicente, JCAP **1211**, 042 (2012), arXiv:1209.0712 [astro-ph.CO].
[40] M. Setare and V. Kamali, JHEP **1303**, 066 (2013), arXiv:1302.0493 [hep-th].
[41] M. Setare and V. Kamali, Gen.Rel.Grav. **46**, 1698 (2014), arXiv:1403.0186 [gr-qc].
[42] M. Cataldo, N. Cruz, and S. Lepe, Phys.Lett. **B619**, 5 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0506153 [hep-th].
[43] I. H. Brevik and O. Gorbunova, Gen.Rel.Grav. **37**, 2039 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0504001 [gr-qc].
[44] B. Li and J. D. Barrow, Phys.Rev. **D79**, 103521 (2009), arXiv:0902.3163 [gr-qc].
[45] A. Avelino and U. Nucamendi, JCAP **0904**, 006 (2009), arXiv:0811.3253 [gr-qc].
[46] A. Avelino and U. Nucamendi, JCAP **1008**, 009 (2010), arXiv:1002.3605 [gr-qc].
[47] H. Velten and D. J. Schwarz, JCAP **1109**, 016 (2011), arXiv:1107.1143 [astro-ph.CO].
[48] H. Velten and D. Schwarz, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 083501 (2012), arXiv:1206.0986 [astro-ph.CO].
[49] H. Velten, D. Schwarz, J. Fabris, and W. Zimdahl, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 103522 (2013), arXiv:1307.6536 [astro-ph.CO].
[50] H. Velten, J. Wang, and X. Meng, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 123504 (2013), arXiv:1307.4262 [astro-ph.CO].
[51] A. Avelino, Y. Leyva, and L. A. Urena-Lopez, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 123004 (2013), arXiv:1306.3270 [astro-ph.CO].
[52] J. D. Barrow, Nucl.Phys. **B310**, 743 (1988).
[53] C. Eckart, Phys.Rev. **58**, 919 (1940).
[54] C. Misner, K. Thorne, and J. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, Gravitation No. pt. 3 (W. H. Freeman, 1973).
[55] R. Maartens, (1996), arXiv:astro-ph/9609119 [astro-ph].
[56] W. Zimdahl and D. Pavon, Phys.Rev. **D61**, 108301 (2000).
[57] W. Israel and J. Stewart, Annals Phys. **118**, 341 (1979).
[58] N. Cruz, S. Lepe, and F. Pena, Phys.Lett. **B646**, 177 (2007), arXiv:gr-qc/0609013 [gr-qc].
[59] I. Brevik, Frontiers in Physics, Vol. **1,**, Article27 (2013), 1312.3102.
[60] I. Brevik, E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri, and S. Odintsov, Phys.Rev. **D84**, 103508 (2011), arXiv:1107.4642 [hep-th].
[61] O. Gorbunova and L. Sebastiani, Gen.Rel.Grav. **42**, 2873 (2010), arXiv:1004.1505 [gr-qc].
[62] I. H. Brevik, O. Gorbunova, and Y. Shaido, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **D14**, 1899 (2005), arXiv:gr-qc/0508038 [gr-qc].
[63] W. Li and L. Xu, Eur.Phys.J. **C73**, 2471 (2013).
[64] B. Pourhassan, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **D22**, 1350061 (2013), arXiv:1301.2788 [gr-qc].
[65] H. Saadat and B. Pourhassan, Astrophys.Space Sci. **343**, 783 (2013).
[66] H. Saadat and B. Pourhassan, Astrophys.Space Sci. **344**, 237 (2013).
[67] M. Setare and A. Sheykhi, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **D19**, 1205 (2010), arXiv:1103.1067 [physics.gen-ph].
[68] G. Leon, Y. Leyva, and J. Socorro, Phys.Lett. **B732**, 285 (2014), arXiv:1208.0061.
[69] J. M. Heinzle, C. Uggla, and N. Rohr, Adv.Theor.Math.Phys. **13**, 293 (2009), arXiv:gr-qc/0702141 [gr-qc].
[70] L. A. Urena-Lopez, JCAP **1203**, 035 (2012), arXiv:1108.4712 [astro-ph.CO].